

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

*Examiner:* Srilakshmi K. Kumar   *Docket No.:* 2702   *Art Unit:* 2629

*In re:*

*Applicant:*                      Norbert FRUEHAUF

*Serial No.:*                      10/689,352

*Filed:*                              October 20, 2003

***A M E N D M E N T***

May 11, 2007

Commissioner for Patents  
P O Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is responsive to the Office Action of January  
17, 2007.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 over the Inukai reference in view of the Bu reference.

In the Examiner's opinion the present invention can be derived from the combination of the references in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Before the analysis of the prior art, it is believed to be advisable to explain to the Examiner the subject matter of the present invention as defined in claim 1, the broadest claim on file.

Claim 1, the broadest claim on file, defines a driving circuit for an image point 10 of an image screen which has an organic light-emitting diode, comprising the following elements:

- a capacitor C;

- a feedback coupling;

- a first thin film transistor T1 as a current-driving transistor for the diode LED;

- a second transistor T2 which is connected by a current-conducting electrode with a gate of said first transistor T1 and by a second current-conducting electrode with a data conductor D and by its gate electrode with a scanning signal conductor A;

a third thin film transistor T3 which during driving its gate through a driving conductor taps a diode driving current at an output of said first current-driving transistor and supplies a current measuring- and voltage regulating circuit 11,

said current measuring- and voltage regulating circuit 11 providing to the data conductor D a voltage signal which is dependent on a current measuring result and a voltage comparison,

so that the diode LED during driving of said gate of said third transistor T3 due to its non-linear switching characteristic acts as a switch for a current deviation in said current measuring- and voltage regulating circuit 11.

Turning now to the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, it is respectfully submitted that applicant disagreed with the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims.

The Bu reference provides a light emitting diode system with current feedback in order to have a constant current through the OLED. Bu wants to eliminate the effect of variations of the transistor characteristics on the current flowing through the OLED. The solution of Bu however requires a separate switch with an inverter and does not use the switching function of the OLED itself. Further the device of Bu requires to guide the contacts through the semiconductor material of the diode.

The Inukai reference does not intend to get information about the characteristics of the driver transistor of the OLED but only the OLED itself. This object is therefore different from the object of Bu's invention and of the present invention. Therefore Inukai measures the current flowing through the driving transistor. The third transistor in Inukai's circuit has the only task to discharge the storage capacitor 308. The third transistor does not guide the measuring current. Further the power supply circuit and the measuring circuit are the same.

According to the present invention as defined in the claims the measuring circuit and the power supply circuit are separate. The third transistor measures the output current of the second transistor. Therefore the input current of the OLED is measured and not the output current as Inukai does. Further the device of the present invention uses the switching characteristics of the OLED to measure the current. It does not need any additional switch like Bu.

It is therefore believed to be clear that it can not be considered as obvious to combine the teachings of the patents to Inukai and Bu as suggested by the Examiner.

It is also believed to be clear that the present invention as defined in claims 1 and 3 can not be considered as obvious from the prior art applied by the Examiner in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 3 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed together with claim 2 which depends on claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 27233